

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

INTEGRATED INTERAGENCY PRE-APPLICATION (IIP)
NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING PUBLIC WORKSHOP

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2 SARAH BALL
Edison Electric Institute

3
4 CAITLIN CALLAGHAN
US DOE/OE

5 LESLIE CARPENTER
TEP

6
7 SUSAN CHILSON
American Transmission Company

8 STEPHEN FUSILIER
Bureau of Land Management

9
10 DEVIN GLADDEN
US DOE

11 CHARLOTTE GLASSMAN
Duke Energy

12
13 NICOLE LOGAN
United States Senate

14 RACHEL LONDON
USFWS

15
16 RICHARD LOUGHERY
Edison Electric Institute

17 BECKY MANDICH
SCE

18
19 AMBER MARTIN
Spiegel & McDiarmid

20 NINA MCLAURIN
Duke Energy

21
22 KARL MYERS
Tri-State Generation and Transmission Assoc., Inc

23 KAREN ONARAN
Edison Electric Institute

24
25 CHELSEA PELLECCCHIA
ICF

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2

ANTHONY PETTI

3

PG&E

4

ROBERT REUTER

PHI

5

JEFF THOMMES

6

ERM

7

TOM TIERNAN

PennWell

8

ESTHER WHIELDON

9

Politico

10 Presenters:

11

MEGHAN CONKLIN

Deputy Assistant Secretary,

12

Office of Electricity Delivery & Energy

Reliability

13

JULIE A. SMITH

Electricity Policy Analyst

14

Office of Electricity Delivery & Energy

Reliability

15

16

LYNN ALEXANDER

Environmental Protection Specialist

17

Office of Electricity Delivery & Energy

Reliability

18

19 Also Present:

20

JOSHUA SMITH

ICF International

21

KATHERINE L. KONIECZNY

Office of General Counsel

22

Department of Energy

23

JANET HERRIN

Department of Energy

24

25

ELI MASSEY

Department of Energy

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 ANGELA TROY
ICF International

3 CHRISTOPHER L. LAWRENCE
4 Department of Energy

5 JOYCE KIM
6 Department of Energy

7 NAEEMA CONWAY
ICF International

8

9 * * * * *

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (1:00 p.m.)

3 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon and welcome
4 to the Department of Energy's Public Meeting to
5 discuss the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on the
6 Integrated Interagency Pre-Application Process on
7 Electric Grid Transmission. I'm Josh Smith of ICF
8 International and will serve as your meeting
9 facilitator today.

10 Today's meeting will begin with a
11 presentation on the background of the proposed
12 rule and a description of the IIP process in the
13 proposed rule. We will then open the meeting for
14 public comment, questions, and discussion. During
15 public comment we will first call on speakers who
16 have pre-registered and then on those who have
17 requested to speak through the chat panel. Next
18 we will entertain questions submitted via the Q&A
19 panel. Finally, to accommodate those who have
20 joined by phone only I will un-mute all phone
21 lines. At that time please consider muting your
22 own phone and only un-muting when you wish to
23 speak. Any time that you speak please begin by
24 stating your name and organization so that an
25 accurate transcript of this meeting may be

1 prepared.

2 It is now my pleasure to introduce
3 Meghan Conklin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the
4 National Electricity Delivery Division of the
5 Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy
6 Reliability.

7 MS. CONKLIN: Thank you very much, Josh.

8 (Webinar paused while technical
9 difficulties were resolved.)

10 MS. CONKLIN: Okay, thank you.

11 Apologies for the technical difficulties. Again,
12 this is Meghan Conklin with the Office of
13 Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability here
14 at the Department of Energy. Thank you everyone
15 for joining us. Before I start my brief
16 introductory remarks I would remind all of you on
17 the call that the purposes of today's call are to
18 receive public comments from the general public on
19 the Proposed Rule.

20 I'm going to offer some brief background
21 on what the IIP is. The Integrated Interagency
22 Pre-Application Process, or as we call it, the
23 IIP, is meant to provide a roadmap to encourage
24 early coordination between project proponents and
25 Federal permitting agencies for proposed

1 transmission facilities. The proposed IIP
2 regulations provide a framework for DOE to
3 facilitate early cooperation and exchange of
4 environmental information required to cite
5 qualified electric transmission facilities. These
6 activities would occur prior to a project
7 proponent or applicant filing a request for
8 authorization with Federal permitting agencies.
9 The IIP process is designed to one, encourage and
10 improve interagency and intergovernmental
11 coordination, second, encourage early engagement
12 with stakeholders by project proponents, not by
13 Federal agencies, and to help project proponents
14 develop and submit accurate and complete
15 information early in the planning process.

16 The proposed regulations also provide an
17 opportunity for non-Federal agencies, tribal,
18 state, or local governments to coordinate separate
19 non-Federal permitting and environmental reviews
20 with the Federal permitting agencies. And again
21 the IIP process is voluntary.

22 The IIP process is part of an overall
23 Obama administration priority to make transmission
24 permitting issues more efficient. The IIP process
25 is an outcome of a series of interagency

1 negotiations, revisions, and discussions. On June
2 7, 2013 a Presidential Memorandum, entitled
3 "Transforming Our Nation's Electric Grid Through
4 Improved Citing, Permitting, and Review" was
5 published to address several transmission
6 permitting issues. For example, the 2013
7 Presidential Memorandum directed Federal agencies
8 to create an IIP across the Federal government to
9 help identify and address issues before formal
10 permit application processes begin and to
11 streamline the coordination of permitting across
12 Federal, state, and tribal governments.

13 I'm next going to be turning it over to
14 Julie Smith, also with the Office of Electricity
15 Delivery and Energy Reliability.

16 MS. SMITH: Good afternoon, everyone.
17 I'm going to speak about the background of the IIP
18 authority, which many of you are very familiar
19 with and have also been involved in yourselves.
20 Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005
21 created Section 216(h) of the Federal Power Act
22 which required DOE to act as a lead Federal agency
23 for the purposes of coordinating all applicable
24 Federal authorizations and related environmental
25 reviews of electronic transmission projects

1 requiring multiple Federal authorizations.

2 This Section, Section 216(h), provides
3 for the coordination of Federal transmissions
4 seeking site determination for project proponents
5 that are looking for permits, special use
6 authorizations, certifications, opinions, and/or
7 other approvals required under Federal law to site
8 an electric transmission facility. 216(h)(3)
9 specifically requires DOE to coordinate Federal
10 authorization and review processes to the extent
11 practicable with any tribes, multistate entities
12 and state agencies that have their own separate
13 permitting and environmental reviews. And
14 216(h)(4)(C) further requires DOE to establish an
15 expeditious pre-application mechanism. It is
16 important to note that while 216(h) of the Federal
17 Power Act, and many of you have heard us say this
18 before in former presentations, while it gave us
19 the authority and the responsibilities for these
20 coordination activities, the rule was written in
21 such a way that DOE was not provided enforcement
22 authority. So as you will see and as you can see
23 in the proposed rule the rule is typically
24 strongly encouraging participation by agencies in
25 the IIP without DOE being able to make people come

1 to the table, if you will.

2 Next slide. Quickly on the background,
3 again many of you are familiar. The IIP came out
4 of a process, an outcome of interagency
5 negotiations, revisions, discussions. As you can
6 see 216(h) of the Federal Power Act came about in
7 2005, so there have been several discussions over
8 the past years, and particularly in the last three
9 or four years in trying to pin down a
10 pre-application process. Following 2005, in 2009
11 DOE and eight other Federal agencies entered into
12 a Memorandum of Understanding that described each
13 of the agency's responsibilities in executing
14 Section 216(h) of the FPA, particularly when it
15 came to proposed crossings of transmission lines
16 of Federal lands or lands administered and managed
17 by Federal agencies. The MOU gives DOE the
18 authority to designate a lead Federal agency
19 responsible for completing necessary environmental
20 reviews for a transmission project, particularly
21 those that involve Federal lands.

22 On March 22, 2012 the President issued
23 the Executive Order 13604, improving performance
24 of Federal permitting and review of infrastructure
25 projects that directed all Federal agencies to

1 execute Federal permitting and review processes
2 with maximum efficiencies and effectiveness.
3 Following up, on June 7, 2013 a Presidential
4 Memorandum titled "Transforming Our Nation's
5 Electric Grid Through Improved Siting, Permitting,
6 and Review" was issued to address several
7 transmission permitting issues. Section 4A of the
8 PM directs member agencies of the steering
9 committee, created in EO 13604, to develop an
10 integrated interagency pre-application process for
11 significant onshore electric transmission projects
12 requiring Federal approval. Many of those
13 agencies on that steering committee are also the
14 agencies that are a party to the Nine Agency
15 Memorandum of Understanding.

16 On August 29, 2013, and after much
17 negotiation and discussion with the nine agency
18 members of the ROTT, the Department of Energy
19 released a request for information that was
20 seeking public comment on a proposed IIP process.
21 The process at that time contained four steps, had
22 a very different concept in terms of when it was
23 initiated and when things came to close. In
24 response to that request for information, many of
25 the folks here today provided DOE with comments.

1 There were over 25 sets of comments that DOE used
2 to modify revisions to the IIP so that you see
3 what is drafted.

4 Drafts of the IIP have also been --
5 following comments and incorporation of those
6 comments or themes of those comments into the rule
7 and a revised rule, there have been drafts of a
8 revised process that had been submitted to the
9 rapid response team agencies for comments and
10 revision. So what you see in the Notice of
11 Proposed Rulemaking is indeed a negotiated rule
12 and one that has gone through several rounds of
13 interagency comments. And we feel that we have
14 encapsulated many, if not all, of the concerns
15 that we heard from our agencies as well as
16 hopefully from industry, but we are looking
17 forward to hearing what you have today.

18 The February 2, 2016 NOPR incorporates
19 all of those comments. So if you had submitted a
20 comment to date, that has been incorporated into
21 the decision making and revision process for the
22 IIP. And carrying forward, we will formalize any
23 further comments in the IIP process in a final
24 regulation hopefully.

25 The next slide. On the overall intent,

1 you know, kind of the thought, the thrust,
2 philosophical thrust behind the IIPs, that early
3 coordination with those permitting entities,
4 particularly Feds, states, multistate agencies,
5 and tribes allows us to have early information
6 sharing. That early information sharing where you
7 can look at information gaps, identify issues of
8 concern that perhaps had not been identified
9 before, allow for a better collective idea of
10 planning for these transmission projects. So if
11 you're thinking about these issues, or perhaps
12 information that might be needed or permit
13 requirements early on in planning, then the idea
14 would be that once the permit applications come to
15 Federal entities for authorization that those
16 applications would be more robust and more
17 complete, thereby making necessary back and forth
18 that sometimes occurs in that process currently.
19 With having more full applications, better
20 understanding, better information up front related
21 to a proposal, the idea would be that there would
22 be efficiencies in NEPA reviews. Having that full
23 information up front, folks already understanding
24 and having an idea of the project, the project
25 context, rather than starting from scratch, if you

1 will. And then once we have some of those
2 efficiencies and we realize those efficiencies in
3 NEPA reviews through coordination and better
4 information we would see improvements in
5 permitting times.

6 So that is the overall larger, broader
7 context of the IIP. I'm going to now hand this
8 off to Lynn Alexander to get into the specifics
9 and the nitty gritty of the Proposed Rule.

10 MS. ALEXANDER: Thanks, Julie. Hello,
11 my name is Lynn Alexander. The details of the IIP
12 are in the regulations themselves. As Julie
13 mentioned, the overall purpose of the IIP is to
14 eventually improve permitting times for
15 transmission projects. The key steps in the IIP
16 process are first that a project proponent will
17 submit an initiation request to the Department of
18 Energy. That initiation request starts the entire
19 IIP process. The request would include a summary
20 of the qualifying project, which is basically a
21 project description. It would include a
22 description of the affected environmental
23 resources and an impact summary, maps, geospatial
24 information, other data, and a summary of the
25 early identification of project issues. So as you

1 can see before the IIP process can begin, the
2 project proponent, the developer, has to have a
3 fairly robust plan in place. This is something
4 that would occur fairly far into the development
5 process for a project, not at the very beginning
6 and conceptual stages, but all right, here we've
7 got -- we're ready to go, but before permit
8 applications are submitted to Federal agencies or
9 state and tribal agencies.

10 The second step in the IIP process after
11 the initiation request is submitted to DOE is that
12 DOE will evaluate the initiation request, inform
13 potentially affected Federal, state, and tribal
14 agencies that request has been received, and DOE
15 will provide all submitted information to both
16 Federal and non-Federal entities. DOE will then
17 coordinate an IIP initial meeting. There are two
18 meetings in the proposed process. At the initial
19 meeting agencies will provide feedback to the
20 project proponent on environmental concerns,
21 project issues, data gaps, and/or missing
22 information for their permit applications.

23 The next step in the process is that DOE
24 will record key issues, information gaps, and data
25 needs identified by Federal and non-Federal

1 entities in an IIP initial meeting summary
2 document that would be provided to the project
3 proponent.

4 The next step in the process is that
5 after the initial meeting and DOE sending out a
6 summary of that meeting, if the project proponent
7 wishes they can continue the process by sending an
8 IIP process closeout meeting request to DOE. The
9 closeout meeting request would include updates to
10 any information supplied as part of the initiation
11 request and also an indication of any changes made
12 to the project to the feedback received during the
13 initial IIP meeting. At the closeout meeting
14 agencies will review updated summaries and data
15 and provide any additional feedback to the project
16 proponent on environmental concerns, project
17 issues, data gaps, and/or missing information that
18 would be expected before an application for
19 Federal authorization is submitted to a Federal
20 entity. So these two meetings and the
21 documentation of those meetings back and forth are
22 really the meat of the IIP process, and this is
23 where coordination between project proponents and
24 developers and the Federal, state, and tribal
25 agencies will occur. And the point is when the

1 developer is ready to submit their permit and
2 approval applications, those applications are as
3 robust and complete as possible, and therefore
4 speed up the process for the permits to be issued.

5 At the process closeout meeting agencies
6 will review the information and let the proponent
7 know of any additional data gaps or missing
8 information. Then DOE will record discussions of
9 key project issues, information gaps, and data
10 needs identified by Federal and non-Federal
11 entities during the IIP process and prepare a
12 final IIP resources report. And so that final IIP
13 resources report will summarize everything that's
14 been brought up so far in the IIP process. The
15 resources report includes a summary of project
16 information, a summary of environmental resources
17 and potential impacts, a summary of project and
18 stakeholder outreach, as well as an indication of
19 outstanding issues.

20 So that pretty much closes out the IIP
21 process. DOE will keep all information gathered
22 and submitted during the IIP process in an IIP
23 process administrative file which DOE will give to
24 the potential NEPA lead agency, Federal agency,
25 following the submission of Federal Authorization

1 Applications. It's important to note that DOE
2 will keep that administrative file for a while,
3 but will not be keeping all of the information
4 indefinitely. Whatever Federal agency is selected
5 as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
6 lead agency, that agency is who would keep the
7 information going forward after permit
8 applications have been received.

9 Next I'd like to go through, kind of
10 section by section a little bit, what is in the
11 regulation and in the regulatory text. Section
12 900.1 simply states the purpose of the
13 regulations. Important parts of that include that
14 the IIP process occurs before any application or
15 request for authorization is submitted to Federal
16 agencies. So this would be kind of the first step
17 in your interaction with Federal agencies. This
18 part improves the siting process by facilitating
19 the early submission, compilation and
20 documentation of information needed for subsequent
21 coordinated transparent environmental review of a
22 qualified project or approved other project by
23 Federal entities under NEPA following the
24 submission of an application or request for
25 authorization. So the IIP process is not meant to

1 supplant any other Federal permitting processes or
2 the NEPA process. It is meant to coordinate prior
3 to those processes.

4 Applicability of the part. Section
5 900.2 discusses the applicability. The IIP
6 regulations apply to qualifying projects -- and
7 we'll go over the definition of that in a second
8 -- and to other projects that are at the
9 discretion of DOE's Office of Electricity Delivery
10 & Energy Reliability. Again, the part does not
11 supplant but rather complements Federal entities'
12 pre-application procedures for a Federal
13 authorization, and participation in the IIP
14 process does not guarantee issuance of any
15 required Federal authorization.

16 Section 900.3 of the regulations
17 includes definitions. One of the most important
18 definitions in there is what is a qualifying
19 project. Since these regulations apply to
20 qualifying projects we need to know what those
21 are. A qualifying project is a non-marine or
22 on-land high voltage electric transmission line of
23 230 kilovolts or above and its attendant
24 facilities, or other regionally or nationally
25 significant non-marine electric transmission lines

1 and their attendant facilities. So a non-marine
2 high voltage electric transmission line in which:
3 first, all or part of the proposed electric
4 transmission line is used for the transmission of
5 electric energy in interstate commerce for sale at
6 wholesale; and second, all or part of the proposed
7 electric transmission line crosses jurisdictions
8 administered by more than one Federal entity, or
9 crosses jurisdictions by a single Federal entity
10 and is considered for Federal financial assistance
11 from a Federal entity. So these are for large
12 transmission lines that cross state boundaries or
13 that sell electric energy across state boundaries
14 and that are on land, not marine, and either one
15 or more Federal entities are involved in the
16 approval process of this transmission line. So
17 some things that qualifying projects do not
18 include that you can read though later.

19 Other projects. Another definition
20 that's important is what other projects are. Some
21 projects that don't meet the definition of
22 qualifying project can use the IIP process but
23 only if they apply to and are approved by the
24 Office of Electricity Delivery & Energy
25 Reliability first. And the process to do that is

1 outlined in the regulations.

2 A Federal entity, just for your
3 information, is any Federal agency with
4 jurisdictional interests that may have an effect
5 on a proposed qualifying project and that is
6 responsible for issuing a Federal authorization
7 for the proposed qualifying project or attendant
8 facilities.

9 Section 900.3 of the regulations -- one
10 other important definition is the definition of
11 project proponent. A project proponent is a
12 person or entity who initiates the IIP process in
13 anticipation of seeking Federal authorizations for
14 a qualifying project or other project.

15 So now we get to the fun part. Section
16 900.4 begins the IIP process description itself.
17 Paragraph (a) lists the -- it says that the IIP
18 process is intended for a project proponent who
19 has already identified study corridors or
20 potential routes within a project area. So again
21 this is for projects that are further along in
22 their development process. The IIP process is
23 optional and voluntary for the project proponents
24 to participate in. Paragraph (b) lists the
25 project proponent electing to utilize the IIP

1 process must submit an initiation request to DOE
2 to start the IIP process as we mentioned earlier.
3 Paragraphs (c), (d), and (f) describe how to
4 complete portions of the initiation request.
5 Throughout the regulations, especially in Section
6 900.4, you'll see page limits for each portion of
7 the initiation request and other documents that
8 need to be submitted to be DOE. There are page
9 limits listed. And also the timing is listed for
10 each part of the process. So, for example, within
11 15 calendar days of receiving an initiation
12 request DOE will then notify by email all Federal
13 entities and non-Federal entities with an
14 authorization that's potentially necessary to cite
15 the qualifying project.

16 The next step in the IIP process is
17 listed in paragraph (h), and that is within 30
18 calendar days of receiving an initiation request
19 DOE shall notify the project proponent whether
20 either: one, the initiation request meets all
21 requirements or; two, the initiation request did
22 not meet all requirements and how the project
23 proponent may address any deficiencies. Once an
24 initiation request has been completed and DOE
25 notifies the proponent that the request meets all

1 requirements then DOE will provide Federal and
2 non-Federal entities with access to all electronic
3 copies of the initiation request. So DOE
4 encourages submission of the initiation request by
5 project proponents electronically to facilitate
6 sharing of that information with the Federal and
7 non-Federal entities that are involved in the
8 project.

9 When it comes to submitting an
10 initiation request it's also important to note
11 that if the project proponent has any business
12 confidential items or data in the request, that
13 business confidential information should be marked
14 clearly as such. Just state on there business
15 confidential wherever it applies so that the
16 Federal and non-Federal entities know to keep that
17 information confidential during the IIP process.
18 If items are confidential but are not marked as
19 such, then the agencies don't know to keep it
20 confidential. And, again, Federal agencies will
21 keep that information confidential during the IIP
22 process.

23 Paragraph (j) of Section 900.4 states
24 that DOE will hold the initial meeting with the
25 project proponent and all Federal and non-Federal

1 entities no later than 45 calendar days after
2 notifying all parties that the initiation request
3 meets requirements. After the initial meeting a
4 project proponent using the IIP process must
5 submit a closeout meeting request, which is the
6 second meeting, to DOE to complete the IIP
7 process. And that closeout meeting request should
8 be submitted to DOE no less than 45 calendar days
9 after the initial meeting. And, finally, DOE will
10 hold the closeout meeting within 90 days of
11 receiving a closeout meeting request if such
12 request meets all regulatory requirements.

13 So, as you can see, in the section by
14 section analysis, DOE has tried to list out some
15 reasonable timeframes for all of these different
16 steps to occur. It takes a little bit of time to
17 organize and determine what agency should be
18 involved for the initial meeting and to share all
19 the information, to organize a meeting. Just to
20 note, the IIP initial meeting should occur either
21 where the qualifying project is located or in the
22 region where the qualifying project and its route
23 are located. Although there would be an in-person
24 meeting, some agencies may not be able to
25 participate in person that are involved; however

1 they would be participating via teleconference.
2 So the point is to include as many people as
3 possible and as many agencies as possible and make
4 it as easy as possible for everyone to participate
5 in the initial meeting especially, and also the
6 closeout meeting.

7 Another part of the IIP process is more
8 on the Federal agency side. Section 900.5
9 discussed the selection of a NEPA lead agency.
10 The NEPA lead agency decision will occur in
11 consultation with the DOE and the Federal
12 entities. DOE and Federal entities will
13 coordinate the selection of a potential NEPA lead
14 agency responsible for preparing an environmental
15 review document under NEPA for a proposed
16 qualifying project. And that NEPA lead agency
17 decision will be made within 45 days of DOE
18 receiving the closeout meeting request, and the
19 decision will then be shared with the project
20 proponent.

21 And, finally, Section 900.6 of the
22 proposed regulations discusses the IIP process
23 administrative file. DOE will maintain all
24 information and documents that were part of the
25 IIP process for future use in reviewing any

1 applications for required Federal authorizations
2 for the proposed qualifying project. And if
3 anyone has any input on how that process
4 administrative file should be shared we welcome
5 any feedback from you and look forward to hearing
6 what you all have to say.

7 Again, the information that was
8 collected and developed during the IIP process is
9 for use in both the final NEPA document for a
10 project and also any other Federal or non-Federal
11 entity decision making processes related to the
12 project.

13 One other thing to note is public
14 participation. We haven't mentioned that much so
15 far. The IIP process is meant to occur before
16 project proponents submit applications to the
17 Federal government and therefore it is also meant
18 to occur before Federal public participation
19 occurs. That means that the Federal government
20 agencies will not be starting a formal public
21 participation process during this IIP process.
22 However, DOE does encourage the project proponents
23 to begin, and early and often start public
24 participation on a project on the private side.

25 So that kind of concludes the

1 regulations themselves and what has been proposed
2 to date. And we're going to go back to Julie for
3 a discussion on what the next steps are in the
4 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking process.

5 MS. SMITH: Thank you. Hello again.
6 The proposed rule is out and is available for
7 public comment through April 4, 2016. DOE will
8 consider your comments and late comments, to the
9 extent practicable, that they are submitted.
10 After the public comment period we will
11 consolidate these comments, review the comments,
12 and develop a final rule, make revisions. We will
13 be developing that final rule in coordination with
14 our rapid response team for transmission agencies,
15 as we have done throughout with this process.
16 Also once that process rule has been finalized we
17 will coordinate development of implementation
18 tools that would be used. There are mentions of a
19 checklist perhaps to help project proponents when
20 they are putting together their initiation meeting
21 requests and the materials that are requested for
22 the IIP process in order for that to be initiated
23 and coordinated by DOE. And we are also
24 continuing our progress on other complementary
25 tools such as the rapid tool kit, which has been

1 applied to the state members of the Western
2 Governors Association and we are extending that
3 work and that tool to covering member states of
4 the Midwest Governors Association. So those
5 electronic tools will also be out there and will
6 be continuing to be developed. And to mention, as
7 Lynn rightly mentioned, that while we would be
8 focusing meetings in the area or region where a
9 particular project may be proposed, that we would
10 be providing electronic access. Not only
11 teleconferencing, but also to the IIP files and we
12 would be intending on using the MAX system, OMB's
13 MAX system as the platform for sharing that
14 information and the interagency tools there.

15 So basically we'll be accepting comments
16 from April 4, we'll be developing a final rule,
17 and then we will be developing those
18 implementation tools and materials, guidance
19 pieces, based on that rule with our rapid response
20 team agency members. And we are looking forward
21 to your input on this rule.

22 So now that we are at this point are
23 there any questions? I'm sure there are questions
24 for the rule or comments on the rule, but are
25 there any questions related to the presentation or

1 any of the information that any of the speakers
2 has presented here? We would like questions on
3 the presentation first perhaps, maybe provide some
4 clarity, and then move into some of your more
5 formal comments on the rule itself.

6 MR. SMITH: At this time we've received
7 no notes in the chat room and we've received no
8 electronic questions in the Q&A. We'll give you
9 all about a minute or two to input any questions.
10 If none appear then we will open the phone lines
11 and ask folks to introduce themselves and to
12 address their questions to the group. We're just
13 going to pause here for two minutes.

14 The question that we've received in the
15 chat room is "Is it possible to get a copy of the
16 PowerPoint." A PDF of the presentation has
17 already been posted to the website, to the Notice
18 of Proposed Rulemaking site, but we can as well
19 follow up with an email to attendees and provide
20 that link directly.

21 MS. ALEXANDER: We've got another
22 question here. "Does a project proponent need to
23 submit an application to the relevant states
24 before requesting the Federal IIP process?" And
25 the answer to that is no. The IIP process is

1 meant to happen before submitting any permit
2 applications or approval applications to the
3 Federal government. And that can also come before
4 applications to state or local governments as
5 well.

6 MS. SMITH: Right. Obviously
7 understanding that many of the states are deciding
8 authorities, the states are the deciding
9 authorities when it comes to transmission lines,
10 it may be that your timing of permitting
11 authorization requests is either to states, either
12 it goes before the Federal process, or vice versa,
13 or at the time same. So we recognize that there
14 may be a timing issue, but there are no
15 requirements related to that timing issue in order
16 to request involvement in the IIP and be
17 considered.

18 MS. ALEXANDER: It's just meant to
19 happen before Federal applications.

20 MS. SMITH: Correct. Yes. Ideally it
21 would be that the environmental review could
22 happen simultaneously, but again that works out in
23 some states and it doesn't work out in others.

24 MR. SMITH: Okay. Seeing no additional
25 questions we're going to un-mute all of the phone

1 lines now. If your line is not muted we recommend
2 that you do that on your side. At this time all
3 phones have been un-muted. Anyone who has a
4 question or a comment about the rule, please begin
5 by stating your full name and your organization
6 and then follow with your question or comment.

7 (Overheard participant side
8 conversation omitted.)

9 MS. SMITH: So, Robert, do you have a
10 question for us on the rule?

11 SPEAKER: Rick had his hand up too,
12 right?

13 MR. SMITH: Okay. Robert Reuter of PHI
14 we have a hand raised for you. If you have a
15 question or a comment we're listening.

16 MR. REUTER: No, I have no question or
17 comment.

18 (Discussion off the record)

19 MS. ALEXANDER: Okay. It looks like you
20 don't have anyone else at the moment who wanted to
21 ask any questions or submit any comments through
22 the webinar today, but if you come up with
23 something while I'm speaking please feel free to
24 raise your hand, write in a chat, or speak up.

25 On the screen you'll see we've got for

1 more information all of the documents that we've
2 discussed today, the proposed rule itself, the
3 notice for this meeting, a PDF of the PowerPoint
4 slides from today's presentation. And other
5 information on the IIP process is available at the
6 link on this slide here at
7 energy.gov/oe/downloads/notice-proposed-rulemaking-integrated-interagency-pre-application-process-iip-electric. Sorry for that long link, but
8 that link right there is where you can find all
9 the documents related to this rule. There is also
10 a link on that page to comments that have been or
11 will be received on the Notice of Proposed
12 Rulemaking. And as Josh mentioned, we will send
13 an email out to everyone who registered as a
14 participant in the webinar today with the PDF of
15 today's slides as well as this link to the IIP
16 website.

17
18
19 So go to that website if you need more
20 information. If you have any further questions or
21 would like updates on the IIP process rule, you
22 can send your email address and contact
23 information to our email address, which is OERegs,
24 that's O-E-R-e-g-s@hq.doe.gov.

25 And we would like to ask, if anyone on

1 the phone has tried to send an email to the OERegs
2 email address and had any problems, if you could
3 let us know here on the phone. We're working
4 through a new system and just wanted to make sure
5 that people have been able to send emails if
6 they've tried. Has anyone had any problems with
7 that email address?

8 Okay. Well, if you do come up with any
9 problems -- hopefully the email address will be
10 working very soon.

11 MS. SMITH: Or if not you can contact
12 me. You can contact me or Lynn and we will deal
13 with those issues.

14 MS. ALEXANDER: And Julie's --

15 MS. SMITH: I'm still at Julie,
16 J-U-L-I-E, A.Smith@hq.doe.gov,
17 JulieA.Smith@hq.doe.gov.

18 MS. ALEXANDER: And my name is Lynn
19 Alexander. My email address is Lynn,
20 L-Y-N-N,.Alexander, A-L-E-X-A-N-D-E-R,
21 @hq.doe.gov, Lynn.Alexander@hq.doe.gov.

22 We'll leave the line open for another
23 minute or two. If anyone has any late questions
24 or comments that they'd like to share, feel free.
25 But otherwise we look forward to receiving

1 comments, either through the OERegs@hq.doe.gov
2 email address or regulations.gov website. And all
3 of the information on how to submit comments is in
4 the proposed rule itself, which again is on the
5 energy.gov OE website link that we read off and is
6 on this slide here.

7 MS. SMITH: And just as a final note, I
8 did want to say thank you to all of the folks on
9 the webinar for today's participation as well as
10 many of you who have submitted previous comments,
11 attended workshops, been on other calls, been on
12 conferences where we've presented on this topic.
13 It's been through your help and through the
14 agency's help that we've been able to hopefully
15 develop a rule that will help us gain some
16 efficiencies in our permitting and review
17 processes in the Federal government.

18 But it looks like we might have somebody
19 who might want to speak.

20 MR. SMITH: Tom Tiernan of PennWell,
21 you've raised your hand. Do you have a comment or
22 question?

23 MR. TIERNAN: Yes. Thanks. I'm a
24 reporter with Trade Press. I just wanted to
25 clarify that. But I do have a question on timing

1 of the final rule. I don't know if that's -- I
2 didn't see anything on that. I'm just curious of
3 what's common on the NOPR, if there's any kind of
4 expected time frame on when a final rule might
5 come out.

6 MS. CONKLIN: Tom, this is Meghan
7 Conklin. Thank you for that question. At this
8 point I can't really speculate on when we should
9 expect a final rule. It really depends on how
10 many comments we have and how much time it takes
11 for DOE in order to evaluate those comments. But
12 we'll certainly be back in touch once we expect to
13 be close to issuing a final rule.

14 MR. TIERNAN: Okay. Thank you.

15 MS. ALEXANDER: Future information on
16 the IIP process rulemaking will also be included
17 on that OE website that we mentioned earlier.

18 Are there any other questions? Okay.
19 Well, thank you all very much for calling in and
20 participating in our webinar today. We here at
21 DOE appreciate your participation and we look
22 forward to receiving any comments that you have by
23 April 4.

24 Okay. Thank you. We're going to log
25 off now.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Whereupon, at 2:00 p.m., the
PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)

* * * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III, notary public in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under my direction; that the witnesses were sworn to tell the truth under penalty of perjury; that said transcript is a true record of the testimony given by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was called; and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public, in and for the
District of Columbia My Commission
Expires: March 31, 2017